

Docket No: PAPIERNIK-3
Serial No: 10/811,073

REMARKS

The last Office Action of August 17, 2005, has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. No claim has been canceled. Claims 9, 10 and 11 have been added. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sartorio, of record, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 3,182,495 to Johnson.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sartorio in view of Johnson and further in view of Stutzacker, of record.

Claims 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sartorio in view of Johnson and Stutzacker, and further in view of Halstrick., of record.

Record is also made of a telephonic interview between applicant's representative and the Examiner as well as the Primary Examiner, which took place on November 16, 2005. The Examiners are thanked for their help and assistance as well as for the courtesies extended to Counsel at that time. During the course of the interview, the present application was extensively discussed, and applicant's representative pointed out to the differences between the Sartorio reference and the subject matter according to the present invention. The

Docket No: PAPIERNIK-3
Serial No: 10/811,073

Examiners agreed that the subject matter of the present invention is distinguishable over the applied prior art, however, claim 1 requires clarification as to the structural relationship between the elements.

As a result of the interview, applicant now submits amendments to claim 1 which are drawn up in accordance with the agreement at the interview so as to overcome the rejection to the claims as set forth in the Examiner's Official Action of August 17, 2005 and to place the application in formal condition for allowance. In addition, applicant has added claims 9 to set forth the perpendicular movement of the support elements to the primary crossbeam, as shown in Fig. 1. Claims 10 and 11 have been added to set forth a cross-sectional profile of the secondary crossbeam. Support therefore can be found in paragraph [0018] of the instant specification.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate conditions for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully

Docket No: PAPIERNIK-3
Serial No: 10/811,073

requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: November 17, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:WS:af